



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
12/564,814	09/22/2009	Jenngang Shih	2009P00135US	9200

62730 7590 04/06/2017
SAP SE
3410 HILLVIEW AVENUE
PALO ALTO, CA 94304

EXAMINER

CHAUDHURI, ANITA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2173

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-------------------	---------------

04/06/2017

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

APRIL.MENG@SAP.COM
GIPinhouse@sap.com

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

Ex parte JENNGANG SHIH

Appeal 2016-003833
Application 12/564,814¹
Technology Center 2100

Before THU A. DANG, JOHN A. EVANS, and CARL L. SILVERMAN,
Administrative Patent Judges.

SILVERMAN, *Administrative Patent Judge.*

DECISION ON APPEAL

Appellant appeals under 35 U.S.C. § 134(a) from the Examiner's Final Rejection of claims 1 and 3–22, which constitute the only pending claims. We have jurisdiction under 35 U.S.C. § 6(b).

We reverse.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

The invention relates to a pattern analysis system to enable a user to obtain specific analysis from multi-dimensional storage structures. Abstract; Spec. ¶¶ 1–4. Claim 1 is exemplary of the matter on appeal (disputed limitations emphasized):

¹ According to Appellant, the real party in interest is SAP AG ("SAP"), a Corporation of Germany. Br. 3.

1. A method comprising:
receiving a pattern selection from a user through a guided user interface that restricts the pattern selection to one of a set of available patterns in a *multi-dimensional data source* without requiring specific user knowledge of the set of available patterns;
receiving a parameter selection from the user through the guided user interface that restricts the parameter selection to a set of available parameters in the multi-dimensional data source associated with the pattern selection; and
executing by a computer system the pattern selection and the parameter selection on the multi-dimensional data *source to obtain a report with deterministic values.*

Br. 17 (Claims App.).

THE REJECTIONS²

Claims 1, 3–6, 9–12, 15–19, 21 and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Ramer et al. (US 2008/0214155 A1; pub. Sept. 4, 2008) (“Ramer”) and Akaboshi (US 2003/0195874 A1; Oct. 16, 2003) (“Akaboshi”). Final Act. 3–5.

Claims 7, 8, 13–14, and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Ramer, Akaboshi, and Bernacki et al. (US 7,801,874 B2; iss. Sept. 21, 2010) (“Bernacki”). Final Act. 5–6.

ANALYSIS

Appellant argues, *inter alia*, the Examiner errs in finding Ramer teaches the claim 1 term *multi-dimensional data source*. Br. 9–10 (citing Specification ¶ 17). In particular, Appellant argues this term is defined in

² The Rejection of claims 9–14 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 is withdrawn. *See* Final Act. 2; Advisory Act. 3.

the Specification “[a]s used herein a "multi-dimensional storage structure" refers to a data source with data organized by at least two types of relational tables, dimensional tables and measure tables (sometimes referred to as fact tables), where dimensional tables contain categorical data and measure tables contain numerical data *and the two types of tables are correlated via foreign keys* (emphasis added).” *Id.*

Appellant argues the Examiner errs by ignoring the express requirement that a "multi-dimensional data source" requires data organized by tables *correlated via foreign keys*. *Id.* at 10. According to Appellant, the Examiner merely finds Ramer includes tables containing categorical data and tables containing numerical data but does not identify a foreign key that correlates with the identified tables of categorical and numerical data. *Id.*

The Examiner finds Ramer teaches relational database with categorical data and numerical data. Ans. 7 (citing Ramer ¶¶ 123, 299, 240, 302, 416, 73, and 304). Regarding Appellant’s argument that the Examiner errs in ignoring *and the two types of tables are correlated via foreign keys*, the Examiner finds:

Ramer never discloses the absence of a foreign key. Secondly, the claim language does not read a foreign key. Neither Ramer nor the appellant discloses the programming details on the "keys" of the database tables.

Id.

We are persuaded by Appellant’s arguments as the term "*multi-dimensional data source*" is expressly defined in the Specification as comprising "data organized by at least two types of relational tables," wherein the two types of tables "*are correlated via foreign keys*." See Specification ¶ 17. As such, since the claim recites "multi-dimensional data

source," the claim need not additionally recite "*and the two types of tables are correlated via foreign keys.*"

Regarding the Examiner's finding Ramer never discloses the absence of a foreign key, this is insufficient basis to support a finding that Ramer does disclose, or suggest, a foreign key. Regarding the Examiner's finding neither Ramer nor Appellant discloses programming details of the "keys" of the database tables, the Examiner's finding is insufficient to support a finding that Ramer teaches the claim 1 term *multi-dimensional data source* which includes *and the two types of tables are correlated via foreign keys.*

In view of the above, based on the record before us, we do not sustain the rejection of claim 1, and independent claims 9 and 15 which recite the disputed term. We also do not sustain the rejection of dependent claims 3–8, 10–14, and 16–22. *Cf. In re Fritch*, 972 F.2d 1260, 1266 (Fed. Cir. 1992) ("[D]ependent claims are nonobvious if the independent claims from which they depend are nonobvious . . ."). Because our decision with regard to the disputed limitation is dispositive of the rejection of all pending claims, we do not address additional arguments raised by Appellant.

DECISION

We reverse the Examiner's decision rejecting claims 1 and 3–22.

REVERSED